DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 353 HE 014 838

AUTHOR	Grahn, Joyce; And Others
TITLE	A Faculty Team Approach to Group Advising.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General Coll.
PUB DATE	[82]
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	General College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.
JOURNAL CIT	General College Studies; v17 n1 1981-82
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Advising; Administrative Policy; *College Freshmen; *Faculty Advisers; Faculty Workload; *Group Counseling; Higher Education; *Individual Counseling; Institutional Research; Participant Satisfaction; Questionnaires; School Orientation; *School Registration; Student Attitudes; Time
IDENTIFIERS	*University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

The efficiency and effectiveness of using a group approach to advising by a team of faculty advisors were evaluated in 1980-81 at the General College, University of Minnesota. Group/team advising was compared to individualized, one-to-one advising of first-semester freshmen in terms of student satisfaction with advising, student understanding of General College policies and procedures, and faculty time spent advising. During scheduled registration periods, three days each registration week were set aside for group advising of the experimental group at a central advising location. Group advising sessions consisted of two hour time blocks per registration advising day. One to three members of the advising team were present at the advising session. Student folders were available in advance to the team members, and specifically designed advising materials and techniques were used. A time report sheet and Student Satisfaction-Knowledge Questionnaire were developed and implemented to assess the effect of the procedures (sample instruments are appended). It was found that the group/team advising method resulted in considerable lower average advising time than traditional one-to-one advising. For student satisfaction or knowledge of policies no significant differences were found between the group/team advising method and the one-to-one advising method. The group method saved 14 minutes per student, and assuming an average faculty advising load of 45 students, the group approach saved a typical advisor more than 10 hours during a registration period. Given three such registrations periods during the year, projected time savings generated over 30 hours for the average advisor. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

University of Minnesota
general college
STUDIES

Volume XVII
Number 1
1981-82

ED213353

A FACULTY TEAM APPROACH TO GROUP ADVISING

Joyce Grahn, Associate Professor, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
Peter Kahn, Assistant Professor, University of Minnesota General College
Patrick Kroll, Assistant Professor, University of Minnesota General College

ABSTRACT

This document reports the findings of an experiment to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of using a group approach to advising by a team of faculty advisors. The authors investigated whether type of advising (group/team advising compared to individualized, one-to-one advising) affected student satisfaction with advising student understanding of General College policies and procedures and faculty time spent advising. Study results indicated that the group/team advising model in comparison to individualized advising considerably reduced the average advising time of an advisor with no loss in either student satisfaction with advising or student knowledge of College policies and procedures.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
General College
Univ of Minn
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Editorial Board: The General College Research Group

HE 014 434

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to express thanks to the following colleagues for their assistance in this project:

1. Dave Giese for assisting in research design
2. Alex Kurak for editing
3. Tom Brothen for a review of data analysis and presentation

INTRODUCTION

Academic advising in higher education is an area of continuing experimentation and discussion (Grites, 1979). Colleges and universities facing funding constraints are searching for more efficient and effective ways to advise students. Polson and Jurich (1979), report that the purpose of academic advising at the collegiate level is to provide students with accurate information from a reliable source. In such a context, the role of academic advisor is broadly conceived. Although situations vary from institution to institution, advisor job activities generally involve helping students with three kinds of problems: learning disabilities, social, and financial problems; emotional and psychological problems; and routine academic and career guidance problems (Biggs, et al, 1975). Advisors are thus required to act as counselors, advocates, and guardians (Walsh, 1979).

Studies of advising cover a variety of topics: the use of student peers to advise students (Murry, 1972; Stein and Spille, 1974; Brown and Myers, 1975; Zultowski and Catron, 1976; Hutchins and Miller, 1979); the computerized approach to advising (Aitken and Conrad, 1977); the counseling approach to advising (Teague, 1977); the developmental approach to advising (Crookston, 1972; Mash, 1978; Walsh, 1979); centralized advising (Johnson and Sprandel, 1975; Polson and Jurich, 1979); and group advising (McCusker and Osterlund, 1979; Hutchins and Miller, 1979). Recent studies (Aitken and Conrad, 1977) report faculty dissatisfaction with advising and attribute this dissatisfaction to such factors as lack of incentives to devote much effort to advising, heavy advising loads, and the complexity of advising. These researchers further comment that advising problems are exacerbated because advisors tend to have little specialized knowledge outside their fields of expertise and thus tend to be comfortable advising in only a limited number of areas (Aitken and Conrad, 1977).

The General College, University of Minnesota, is the University's open-admission, general education unit. The College offers two-year and four-year degree programs for students who desire to: 1) receive an associate in arts (AA) degree; 2) pursue a general education baccalaureate degree; 3) combine general education courses with any one of eight different occupational certificate programs; 4) fulfill lower-division general education requirements prior to transfer to another four-year professional or liberal arts program. In terms of academic preparation, many of the College's 3300+ students (1980-81) are educationally disadvantaged. A large portion of these so-called "high risk" students thus require more advising and counseling attention than the typical University student. An example is the approximately 300 foreign students, requiring special help with basic English, who enter the College to develop skills that will permit them to acquire a two or four-year degree.

Since 1975, the General College has undergone a 10% expansion of its enrollment with a 3348 student population during Fall, 1980, in comparison to 3048 in Fall, 1975. Over that five-year period, the number of faculty members available to serve students as advisors declined by approximately 24%. As a

general rule, faculty members at or above the instructor level are assigned advisees. Faculty members below the instructor level are, generally, not assigned advisees on a regular basis as an official responsibility of their employment. In 1975, roughly 95 faculty members at the instructor and higher employment level were available to serve the 3048 student body in the College at that time, an approximate average advising load of 32 advisees per advisor. By the 1980-81 academic year, the number of College faculty at the instructor and higher level (faculty to which advisees can be assigned based on official college policy) had decreased to 72, serving a student population, at 3348, 300 greater than in 1975. The approximate average advising load (46 students) for the 1980-81 faculty advisor was thus 44% greater (an average increase of 14 advisees per advisor) than the 1975 average advising load. These increases in the average advising load in the College have occurred at a time of staffing, curricular and program constraints stemming from budget retrenchment as a result of reduced state revenues. Expanded advising loads, requiring increased time commitments, necessarily curtails faculty productivity in other professional areas such as curriculum development, research, and College and community service. Because of overwhelming demands on their time, faculty members need to consider ways to manage their activities more efficiently, including finding effective alternatives to time-depleting traditional, individualized advising systems.

Academic advising at the General College is an "integral function" of every faculty member (General College Bulletin, 1979-81). Service as an advisor is a major component of the regular duties of each College faculty member. Students are assigned to a faculty advisor during their first quarter in residence at the College. Throughout the year advisors are expected to schedule at least eight hours of office time available to students each week. Three times a year, during fall, winter, and spring quarters, advisors schedule 50% or more of their time over a three-week period to help students with their quarterly registration. Beyond these designated available times, students often "drop in" for individual attention during non-official office hours to see their advisors for informational, counseling, or educational/career planning purposes.

The present General College system of one-to-one personal contact between advisor and student is highly beneficial. A relationship between the parties can grow to provide a support base for the student. However, several weaknesses have been observed in the individualized advising system. During a period of tighter budgets, limited support, and changing demands, faculty members often find themselves spread quite thin across a broad range of responsibilities. Various problems with individualized advising have thus been noted (McCusker and Osterlund, 1979). The types of questions brought to an advisor by students are typically recurring, mechanical ones requiring repetitious explanation of policy and procedures. Because of the lack of opportunity to interact with students with similar problems, students must return to advisors for guidance on each new problem. Individualized advising can also tend to fragment and isolate students, preventing a sharing of common interests and insights into solving similar problems.

To determine whether an advising mechanism as effective yet more efficient than the present individualized advising system could be utilized at the College, the authors decided to construct and evaluate a group/team advising experimental model. Before selecting this student group approach utilizing a faculty team, various other advising experimental models were con-

sidered for possible use in the advising study. The authors eliminated the use of student peer advising, centralized advising, computerized advising, and the counseling approach to advising since none seemed appropriate to General College due to funding, staffing, space and computer access constraints. The developmental approach to advising seemed potentially desirable and is under consideration for the next phase of this project. The student/group faculty/team approach to advising seemed to offer the best opportunity for allowing faculty members adequate advising time while continuing to maintain effective communication with students. It was anticipated that a group/team approach to advising could also promote student interaction regarding common concerns.

METHOD

Overview

To evaluate both the effectiveness and efficiency of a group/team approach to advising, the authors examined several previous studies and found that attrition (Brown and Myers, 1975; Murry, 1972; Zultowski and Catron, 1976), student attitudes (Brown and Myers, 1975; Murry, 1972), grade-point average (Brown and Myers, 1975; Zultowski and Catron, 1976; Murry, 1972), advisor effectiveness (Murry, 1972; Zultowski and Catron, 1976), course changes, room changes, disciplinary referrals, suspensions, and residence hall damage (Hutchins and Miller, 1979) had all been previously used as efficiency/effectiveness measures in advising studies. For this study, the authors chose to measure advising effectiveness on the basis of student satisfaction with advising as well as student knowledge of various General College policies and procedures. Efficiency was measured by faculty time spent advising.

Experimental and control group outcomes were measured by using a survey to rate student satisfaction with advising, by employing a multiple-choice questionnaire to measure student knowledge of General College policies and procedures, and by direct comparisons of faculty advising time. Student demographic characteristics were also analyzed. The research hypotheses tested in the study were:

1. Group/team advising will result in lower average student advising time than traditional individualized advising.
2. Group/team advising will result in higher student satisfaction with faculty advising than traditional individualized advising.
3. Group/team advising will result in greater student knowledge of General College policies and procedures than traditional individualized advising.

Sample

The sample for the group/team advising experiment consisted of 150 randomly selected first-academic-term college freshmen, as of Fall, 1980. Freshmen with no prior college experience were chosen to prevent possible contamination of the survey results which might come from previous exposure to college advising. One-half of the sample was randomly assigned to an experimental group to receive advising from a faculty advising team (consisting of the authors of this report) in a group setting. The other 75 students

received individual advising (three groups of 25 students per research team advisor) and made-up control group 1.

A second control group, consisting of first quarter freshmen assigned to 11 randomly selected College faculty advisors (not members of the group advising team) was also used in the study. These eleven non-team advisors were asked to monitor the time spent with the first eight of their individually advised freshmen.

Experimental Group Advising Procedure

During scheduled registration periods (fall, winter, and spring quarters), three days each registration week were set aside for group advising of the experimental group at a central advising location. Group advising sessions consisted of 2 hour time blocks per registration advising day, staggered on a morning/noon/afternoon basis. Members of the experimental group were notified by letter of scheduled advising days and times, asked to sign up in advance for an advising session and cautioned that, unless a crisis existed to justify such treatment, no drop-in or one-to-one advising would occur.

One to three members of the advising team (the authors of this study), depending on the number of students scheduled, were present at the advising sessions. Student folders were available in advance to the research team advisors to facilitate informed, competent advising appropriate to each advisee within the experimental group. Materials written by the advising team, covering various topics of common and recurrent concern to registering students (transfer options and procedures; grade base choice; cancel/add procedures; interpreting placement scores; general education distribution requirements; transcript analysis worksheets) were distributed to the group advisees to promote efficient and competent registration. Typical registration topics, issues and problems were addressed in these group advising sessions. Team advisors circulated among the group answering questions, offering assistance and guiding the advisees through course selection registration.

A major innovation within the experimental group was the use of specifically designed advising materials and techniques. Various advising materials were reorganized and rewritten for group advising to gear them to a problem solving context. Materials from student bulletins, brochures, and handouts were translated into scripts depicting problems with appropriate behavior and techniques for resolution covering commonly arising problems and education/occupational concerns.

Instrument Design and Validation

The advising team designed and pretested two separate instruments to measure the three experimental variables (satisfaction; knowledge; and time) focused on in the study. Time efficiency of group/team advising was measured on the basis of an Advising Time Report Sheet (see Appendix A) that was drafted by the researchers. The Time Report Sheet listed the names of advisees whom control group advisors were asked to monitor and contained a column under each listed name for reporting time spent per student differentiated by topic of discussion. Before the report sheet was distributed for use, it was pretested

(design, ease of use, understandability, suitability) among five randomly selected faculty members. None found any difficulties in employing it for the intended purpose.

The faculty advising team also designed an instrument to measure both advisee satisfaction with advising as well as knowledge of College policies and procedures (see Appendix D). This Student Satisfaction-Knowledge Questionnaire consisted of multiple-choice items divided into three sections. Section one comprised nine items which focused on demographic characteristics of the survey subjects and the manner in which an advisee sought to contact an advisor.

The second section of the Questionnaire, containing 21 items, evaluated advisee satisfaction with quality of advising received both in terms of general feelings towards overall quality of advising as well as specific areas of advisee concern (quarterly registration; educational goals and career plans; personal problems; and general academic questions). Items from both sections one and two were drawn from two pretested and validated sources, both advising satisfaction questionnaires, one used by General College in an all-College advising study conducted in 1979 and the other designed, validated and used by the Measurement Services Center at the University of Minnesota in an all-University advising study conducted in 1974.

Section three of the Questionnaire consisted of 15 items which measured student knowledge and understanding of various General College policies, procedures and practices. The items were drawn from information contained in the 1980-81 edition of the General College Student Handbook, a publication which is distributed to all first quarter enrollees in the College designed to acquaint them with the breadth of College substantive and procedural functions and operation. The Handbook is essentially an "Everything-you-wanted-to-know-but-didn't-know-what-to-ask-or-where-to-look" publication. Forty knowledge items were initially written by the authors. Criteria used for determining which areas to include in the knowledge items were importance and relevance of an area, clarity of the discussion in the Handbook, presence of a correct/incorrect answer, and reasonableness of expectation that freshmen be familiar with the area. These forty preliminary items were pretested among 12 randomly selected faculty colleagues with requests to critique the questions using the above criteria as well as suggest improvements and identify problems. Seventy-five percent of the pretesters responded, generally finding the idea worthwhile and questionnaire items suitable for the purpose. Based upon the results of this pretesting, 25 items were eliminated and 15 were chosen for final inclusion in the Questionnaire employed in the study.

Pilot Study

Prior to administering the Time Report Sheet and the Student Satisfaction-Knowledge Questionnaire, the materials were distributed as a package among eight randomly chosen faculty. These faculty members were asked to complete the materials, keep track of the time spent and comment on any difficulties they encountered. Five (62%) participants responded. No negative comments were received. Four respondents made comments generally favorable to the materials, noting only scattered, minor difficulties.

Data Gathering Procedure

To assess the satisfaction and knowledge effectiveness variables for the experimental group, the faculty advising team administered the Questionnaire at the group advising sessions. Advising time per student for the experimental group was calculated in the manner explained below in the Data Analysis section of this paper.

Research data for control group 1 was gathered in the following manner. Each member of the research advising team, having been randomly assigned 25 students from the original pool of 150, was responsible for advising their respective 25 assigned advisees utilizing an individual, one-to-one approach. Time spent per individually advised student was noted on the Time Report Sheet (see Appendix A). Each group/team advisor administered the Student Satisfaction-Knowledge Questionnaire to their pools of 25 advisees.

Control group 2 faculty advisors were requested to record the time spent with eight individually-advised students on the Time Report Sheet and to have these advisees complete the study Questionnaire. All eleven advisors selected cooperated in the study. One advisor failed to administer the Questionnaire. At the close of the registration period, Time Report Sheets and Questionnaire responses were collected.

RESULTS

Response Sample

The satisfaction-knowledge (effectiveness variable) response sample consisted of 47 students in the experimental group, 28 students in control group 1, and 30 students in control group 2. The time response (efficiency variable) sample consisted of 55 students in the experimental group, 31 students in control group 1 and 67 students in control group 2. Eight advisees (14%) in the experimental group failed to return questionnaires, as did 3 advisees (10%) in control group 1 and 37 advisees (55%) in control group 2. The poor returned questionnaire rate among control group 2 was not unexpected since the authors had no means of insuring that the study Questionnaire would, in fact, be administered by the members of control group 2 and those faculty advisors, in turn, had no means of insuring that the questionnaires distributed would, in fact, be returned. As noted in the previous section, one member of control group 2 failed to administer the Questionnaire.

A distribution of the demographic characteristics of the survey subjects who returned questionnaires, according to type of advising, is presented in Appendix B. Chi square analysis was used to examine the distribution of these respondents' personal characteristics by type of advising received. The results indicate no difference among the groups in terms of sex, age, advisor contacts, education plans, approach used to contact advisor, advisor accessiblity or time spent planning registration.

Only the item evaluating scheduling of advisor meetings met the required level of significance ($p \leq .05$). Since none of the calculations regarding personal characteristics of the effectiveness response sample was significant, the results suggest that there was no systematic sample selection factor. The data reveal, however, that respondents in control group 1 tended to meet

with their advisors on or after their registration date. The findings ($p = .016$), reported in Table 1, also show that students in the experimental

Table 1

Scheduled Advisor Meetings by Type of Advising

	Experimental Group	Control Group 1	Control Group 2
Before Assigned Registration Date	56.5%	25.0%	66.7%
On Assigned Registration Date	34.8%	50.0%	23.3%
After Assigned Registration Date	8.7%	25.0%	10.0%

group and control group 2 were more likely to meet with their advisor on or before their registration date.

Data Analysis

The Data Analysis portion of this paper consists of three sections: a discussion of advising time results; a report of study findings on advisee satisfaction with advising; and a presentation of data on advisee knowledge of College policies and procedures.

Advising Time: The calculation of advising time for the experimental group differed from the calculations for the control groups. The number of advisees for the experimental group ranged from seven to twenty-two per session. The mean group advising session consisted of 14 students and lasted approximately two hours. Advising time per student was calculated for the experimental group by first determining the time spent for each group advising session multiplied by the number of team advisors present at the sessions. Advising times for group sessions were then added together and divided by the total number of students serviced during all the experimental group advising sessions. An average advising time was calculated for both control groups by first determining total time spent with each advisee for each of the control group advisors and then dividing by the total number of advisees serviced by the control group advisors.

T-tests were used to compare the mean student advising time for the experimental group with each of the two control groups. The results are presented in Table 2. The data clearly show that experimental group students required considerably less advising time than either control group 1 students (11.69 minutes less) or control group 2 students (16.15 minutes less). Hypothesis 1 was thus supported.

Table 2

Summary Table: T-tests...Student Advising Time in Minutes by Type of Advising

Type of Advising	Mean	SD	Difference	T	p-value
Experimental Group	8.73	2.497	11.69	5.86	.001
Control Group 1	20.42	10.893			
Experimental Group	8.73	2.497	16.15	9.45	.001
Control Group 2	24.88	13.505			

Student Satisfaction with Advising: The Student Satisfaction-Knowledge Questionnaire, together with student responses categorized by type of advising, appear in Appendix C. Student satisfaction with advising was evaluated in items five through twenty-five of the Questionnaire. Of particular interest for the experiment was the questionnaire item concerning overall satisfaction with an advisor. Chi square analysis was used to evaluate each of the 21 satisfaction responses by type of advising. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Summary Statistics: Chi Square. . .Advising Satisfaction Items by Type of Advising

Advising Satisfaction	Chi Square	df	p-value
Advisor Information	2.731	8	.950
Advisor Referral Helpfulness	13.630	6	.034
Most Helpful in Planning	11.957	8	.153
Satisfaction with Advisor	8.829	6	.183
Advisor Competence	7.601	6	.269
Course Selection	9.024	8	.340
Class Scheduling	10.556	8	.228
Cancel-Add Procedures	9.702	8	.287
Two-Year Degree Planning	6.476	8	.594
Four-Year Degree Planning	5.317	8	.723
Certificate Programs	4.189	8	.340
Internship	10.677	8	.221
Transfer Requirements	5.797	8	.670
Financial Problems	1.373	8	.995
Employment Problems	10.943	8	.205
Financial Aid	4.853	8	.773
Study habits/load	12.959	8	.113
Skills Deficiencies	10.910	8	.207
Course Difficulties	7.800	8	.453
Grades	8.102	8	.424
Grievance Issues	3.795	8	.875

Only one item, student satisfaction with advisor helpfulness in referring a student to appropriate people for additional assistance, reached the required level of significance. The findings are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Advisor Referral Helpfulness by Type of Advising

Advisor Referral Helpfulness	Experimental Group	Control Group 1	Control Group 2
Very helpful	34.0%	42.9%	40.0%
Moderately helpful	42.6%	25.0%	40.0%
Little or not at all	12.8%	0	0
Cannot say	10.6%	32.1%	20.0%

The data reported in Table 4 indicate that students in the experimental group were more likely to express an opinion regarding advisor referral helpfulness, and their opinions were generally more critical on this item than students in control group 1 and control group 2.

The authors were particularly interested in student response to the questionnaire item "rate your overall satisfaction with your present adviser" which had 5 anchors ranging from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied." The mean scores for overall satisfaction by type of advising are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Mean Scores of Student Satisfaction with Adviser by Type of Advising

Type of Advising	Number of Students	Mean	SD
Experimental Group	47	3.8723	.8752
Control Group 1	28	4.107	.7860
Control Group 2	30	4.133	.9373
N=105			

The data contained in Table 5 suggest that satisfaction scores for each group tended to cluster around "satisfied" with the advisor. To more precisely analyze responses to this overall satisfaction item, analysis of variance was used to examine differences among student satisfaction with advising by type of advising received. Findings ($p=.3409$) indicate that type of advising received by a student did not produce different means for satisfaction. Accordingly, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Knowledge of College Policies and Procedures: Knowledge and understanding of General College policies and procedures was evaluated by student responses to items 26 through 40 on the Student Satisfaction-Knowledge Questionnaire. Each test score had a potential range from 0-15 correct answers. Distribution of total scores by type of advising is arrayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Frequency Distribution of Knowledge Scores by Type of Advising

Number of Correct Items	Experimental Group	Control Group 1	Control Group 2
0	2%	0%	0%
1	0	4	0
2	6	0	0
3	4	7	0
4	9	4	10
5	13	7	7
6	4	7	10
7	11	18	24
8	15	29	13
9	19	11	10
10	13	7	13
11	4	7	13
12	0	0	0
13	0	0	0
14	0	0	0
15	0	0	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
Mean Score	6.89	7.18	7.73
Standard Deviation	2.74	2.41	2.18

The highest score for an individual questionnaire item among all three groups was 73%. None of the groups received particularly high mean scores, which ranged from 46% for the experimental group to 52% for control group 2.

Chi square analysis was used to evaluate each of the 15 knowledge items by type of advising. The results are reported in Table 7.

Table 7

Summary Statistics: Chi Square...Advisee Knowledge of College Policies and Procedures

Knowledge	Chi Square	df	p-value
GC Education Paths	3.692	2	.158
GC Certificate Programs	1.949	2	.337
Courses Offered	3.546	2	.170
Transfer to Four-Year Program	4.780	2	.092
GC A.A. Requirements	1.813	2	.404
CLA Transfer Requirements	2.450	2	.294
Less Than 12 Credits	1.674	2	.433
Financial Aid	.015	2	.992
Course Change	5.109	2	.078
Cancel 2 Weeks	6.504	2	.039
Cancel Procedures	.818	2	.664
Advisor Role	1.033	2	.597
Skills Center	1.574	2	.455
Career Testing	6.040	2	.049
Distribution Requirements	2.653	2	.264
Total Score	20.660	22	.542

The findings reported in Table 7 show that only two items met the required level of significance: procedures for cancelling a course before the end of the second week of the quarter; and procedures for career interest and aptitude testing. The significant Chi square statistics for these two knowledge variables are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8

Course Canceling Procedures Before Second Week of Quarter by Type of Advising

Course Cancelling Procedure	Experimental Group	Control Group 1	Control Group 2
Correct Answer	27.7%	57.1%	36.7%
Incorrect Answer	72.3%	42.9%	63.3%

Table 8 data show that 57% of control group 1 answered the question regarding cancel-add procedures during the first two weeks of class correctly compared to 28% for the experimental group and 37% for control group 2. These findings suggest that students in control group 1 had a better understanding of early course cancellation procedures.

Table 9

Knowledge of Career and Aptitude Testing Procedures by Type of Advising

Career Testing	Experimental Group	Control Group 1	Control Group 2
Correct Answer	51.1%	42.9%	73.3%
Incorrect Answer	48.9%	57.1%	26.7%

Table 9 findings reveal that 73% of the students in control group 2 responded correctly to the item regarding availability of career and aptitude testing compared to 51% for the experimental group and 43% for control group 1. These results suggest that students in control group 2 had a better understanding of career counseling testing procedures.

Analysis of variance was used to compare the knowledge score means for each of the groups.

Findings ($p=.3603$) indicate no significant difference in means for overall knowledge scores by type of advising. Therefore, no evidence existed that the relative effect of the three types of advising differed among the groups for the knowledge experimental measure. Experimental data thus failed to support Hypothesis 3.

In conclusion, the findings of the study show that students advised by means of the group/team method received significantly less advising time with no significant overall loss in knowledge and understanding of General College policies, procedure and practices, and had similar advising satisfaction levels as students receiving traditional one-to-one advising.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

An experiment using a faculty team approach to advising groups of newly-admitted freshmen was conducted in the General College, University of Minnesota, during the 1980-81 academic year. Two control groups were established using traditional one-to-one, advisor-to-student advising. Comparisons of advising results between the experimental group/team approach with the more traditional one-to-one advising control groups are summarized in the following statements:

1. Findings regarding Hypothesis 1 show that the group/team advising method results in considerably lower average

advising time than traditional one-to-one advising and thus Hypothesis 1 was supported.

2. Findings regarding Hypothesis 2 show no significant overall difference in student satisfaction between the group/team advising method and the one-to-one advising method. Thus Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

3. Findings regarding Hypothesis 3 show no significant difference in student knowledge of College policies and procedures between students in group/team versus traditional one-to-one advising. Thus Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

The authors are encouraged by the results of their experiment even though two of the three hypotheses regarding the effectiveness of group/team advising were not supported. Several factors in the experiment suggest that the group/team advising approach has definite advantages over one-to-one advising. First, the time saved with group/team advising compared to one-to-one advising in the control groups was considerable. The combined mean advising time from both control groups was 22.7 minutes per student per advising session. This is nearly three times the average mean advising time of 8.7 minutes per students in the experimental group.

Assuming an average General College faculty advising load of 45 students, the 14 minutes saved per student that can come from utilizing a group approach to advising translates into a time-savings for a typical College advisor of more than ten hours during a typical registration period. Given three such registration periods during the year, projected time savings generated by group/team advising can amount to over 30 hours--nearly a full working week—for the average College advisor. For faculty members with advising loads significantly higher than the College average, projected time savings assume greater importance. Such time savings would necessarily carry less significance for advisors with smaller advising loads. These time savings are especially important if faculty translate them into greater attention towards other responsibilities such as teaching preparation, curriculum/program development, research, committee or community service.

The authors are encouraged by the comparative scores of students in the experimental group regarding knowledge of College procedures and satisfaction with advising. The experimental group did no worse than the control groups in understanding College policies and procedures and there was no significant difference among the groups regarding satisfaction with advising. A noteworthy finding from the study is that, on the whole, there was low student knowledge of College policies and procedures among all three participating groups. This must be of concern to faculty advisors who spend considerable time advising students on procedural matters.

Since group/team advising resulted in a substantial reduction in student contacts with an advisor and total advising time, the faculty team advisors felt less fatigue and stress than is normally experienced during one-to-one advising over a quarterly registration period. Another benefit from group advising observed by the research team was the camaraderie that

developed among the students in the small group advising sessions. This camaraderie enhanced social interaction and encouraged efforts of students to help one another with various common registration issues and problems, thus relieving the advisors of a traditional responsibility associated with individualized advising.

In using a team approach, the investigators found that the team members collectively had a broad-based expertise regarding College and University requirements and procedures. Team members were frequently able to help one another during advising sessions. This type of faculty helping faculty not only has merit for upgrading the quality of advising, but also for orienting new faculty to the advising system of large, complex institutions.

Based upon the positive results of the experiment, the authors plan to utilize the group/team advising approach again during the present academic year and integrate other colleagues into the process.

APPENDIX A

GROUP/TEAM ADVISING

TIME REPORT SHEET

NAMES OF STUDENTS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
TYPE OF STUDENT: Day School, General College Freshman INSTRUCTIONS: For the suitable descriptors below, please record in the appropriate box the approximate NUMBER OF MINUTES you spent with each student. Thank you for your cooperation.															
Planning single-term course schedules: registration; cancel-add; course selection; etc.															
General discussion of long-range educational plans/goals/options: degree & certificate programs; transfer requirements; graduation requirements; etc.															
Personal counseling: emotional, vocational, academic, legal, financial difficulties.															
General discussion of academic problems, questions, and difficulties: skills deficiencies; grades; instructor conflict; etc.															
Advising activities not covered by the above categories.															

-15-

APPENDIX B

Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of General College Advising Questionnaire Respondents by Type of Advising Received.

	Experimental Group	Control Group 1	Control Group 2
Sex			
Male	24 (51%)	16 (57%)	13 (43%)
Female	23 (49%)	11 (39%)	17 (57%)
No answer	0	1 (4%)	0
Total	47 (100%)	28 (100%)	30 (100%)
Age			
17 or under	0	0	0
18-22	43 (92%)	23 (82%)	28 (94%)
23-25	2 (4%)	2 (7%)	1 (3%)
26 or older	2 (4%)	3 (11%)	1 (3%)
Total	47 (100%)	28 (100%)	30 (100%)
Contact time per quarter			
0-2	40 (85%)	23 (82%)	22 (74%)
3-5	5 (11%)	4 (14%)	7 (23%)
6 or more	1 (2%)	1 (4%)	0 (
No answer	1 (2%)	0	1 (3%)
Total	47 (100%)	28 (100%)	30 (100%)
Education Plans			
AA	6 (13%)	1 (4%)	1 (3%)
BAS/BGS	5 (11%)	5 (18%)	8 (26%)
Certificate	3 (6%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)
Transfer	29 (62%)	17 (61%)	17 (57%)
Other	3 (6%)	4 (14%)	2 (7%)
No answer	1 (2%)	0	
Total	47 (100%)	28 (100%)	30 (100%)

APPENDIX C

Comparison of Student Questionnaire Responses by Type of Advising Received: Experimental Group (EC), Control Group I (I), or Control Group II (II).

GENERAL INFORMATION	E N=47	I N=28	II N=30
1. Approach you usually use in seeing your advisor/s:			
a. Make an appointment in advance by phone	9%	7%	27%
b. Make an appointment by signing up on a designated sheet	57	46	57
c. Stop in during office hours without an appointment	19	18	10
d. Stop in at any time and hope to find the advisor/s available	15	25	6
e. Other--Please state	0	0	0
f. No answer	0	4	0
	100%	100%	100%
2. Acessibility of your advisor/s, considering your method of contact:			
a. Always accessible	25%	21%	43%
b. Usually accessible	45	47	40
c. Sometimes accessible	17	18	17
d. Seldom accessible	11	7	0
e. Never accessible	0	0	0
f. No answer	2	7	0
	100%	100%	100%
3. Time spent planning your program before seeing your advisor/s:			
a. Two hours or more	17%	14%	20%
b. One to two hours	41	43	37
c. A half hour to one hour	19	14	27
d. A half hour or less	19	22	16
e. No time	4	7	0
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%
4. When did you see your advisor/s:			
a. Before assigned registration date	55%	25%	67%
b. On assigned registration date	34	50	23
c. After assigned registration date	0	25	10
d. Did not see my assigned advisor at all	9	0	0
e. No answer	2	0	0
	100%	100%	100%
ADVISING SATISFACTION			
5. How well informed are your advisor/s about your academic interests (course prerequisites, course content and level, etc.):			
a. Able to answer or advise me correctly on almost every question I raise	34%	39%	40%
b. Either knows the answer or will find out for me	34	36	37
c. Somewhat helpful	21	18	20
d. Little or no help at all	9	4	3
e. Very poor, has even given me wrong information	2	4	0
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%

	E	I	II
6. Helpfulness of your advisor/s referring you to appropriate sources when you have questions or problems which your advisor/s cannot handle:			
a. Very helpful	34%	43%	40%
b. Moderately helpful	43	25	40
c. Little or not at all helpful	13	0	0
d. Very poor; has misdirected me	0	0	0
e. Cannot say, since such a situation never arose	11	32	20
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%
7. From whom do you receive the <u>most</u> help in registration program planning:			
a. Assigned advisor/s	51%	81%	47%
b. Faculty member other than assigned advisor/s	15	4	14
c. College office staff member other than assigned advisor/s	9	4	3
d. College administrator	2	7	3
e. Other students	23	4	30
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%
8. Rate your overall satisfaction with your present advisor:			
a. Very dissatisfied	0%	0%	0%
b. Dissatisfied	9	4	3
c. Neutral	19	14	27
d. Satisfied	49	50	23
e. Very satisfied	23	32	47
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%
9. If you were in a position to recommend advisors to other students in you major field, what would you say about your advisor:			
a. My advisor is very competent; I would recommend him/her without qualification	34%	46%	43%
b. My advisor is competent in most areas of advising; I would recommend him/her with some qualification	28	32	27
c. My advisor is about average; I would recommend her/him as being not too great but not too bad either	30	14	27
d. My advisor does not function well in her/his advisory capacity; I would recommend that other students try to get someone else	8	0	3
e. No answer	0	7	0
	100%	100%	100%

<u>QUARTERLY REGISTRATION CONCERNS</u>

10. Course selection			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	15%	14%	24%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	25	22	17
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of <u>no help</u>	15	7	3
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of <u>some help</u>	30	54	40
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of <u>great help</u>	15	4	13
f. No answer	0	0	3
	100%	100%	100%

	E	I	II
11. Class scheduling			
a. Not a problem or conern at all	17%	18%	27%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	40	29	13
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	6	7	0
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	26	39	47
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	11	7	13
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%
12. Cancel-add procedures			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	42%	65%	53%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	17	11	7
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	11	4	0
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	19	14	20
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	11	7	20
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%

LONG RANGE EDUCATIONAL/OCCUPATIONAL CONCERNS

13. Two year degree goals/plans/options			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	43%	61%	54%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	21	18	20
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	9	4	3
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	23	7	13
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	4	7	10
f. No answer	0	4	0
	100%	100%	100%
14. Four year degree goals/plans/options			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	38%	18%	37%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	28	29	33
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	6	7	3
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	7	21	17
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	11	21	10
f. No answer	0	4	0
	100%	100%	100%
15. Certificate programs/opportunities			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	51%	64%	60%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	21	14	24
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	7	7	0
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	15	7	13
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	4	4	3
f. No answer	2	4	0
	100%	100%	100%

	E	I	II
16. Internship programs/opportunities			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	47%	64%	64%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	19	17	23
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	13	4	0
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	15	4	13
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	4	7	0
f. No answer	2	4	0
	100%	100%	100%
17. Transfer requirements & procedures			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	26%	21%	40%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	19	11	20
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	8	11	3
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	28	39	24
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	19	18	13
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%

PERSONAL PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS

18. Financial problems			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	47%	47%	47%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	30	32	37
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	6	7	3
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	11	7	10
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	6	7	3
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%
19. Employment problems			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	64%	74%	63%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	9	14	27
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	17	4	3
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	6	4	7
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	4	4	0
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%

GENERAL ACADEMIC CONCERNS

20. Financial aid			
a. Not a problem or concern at all	49%	49%	47%
b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	28	39	40
c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	2	4	0
d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	13	4	10
e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	8	4	3
f. No answer	0	0	0
	100%	100%	100%

		E	I	II
21.	**Study habits/course load**			
	a. Not a problem or concern at all	51%	46%	20%
	b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	30	25	44
	c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	4	7	0
	d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	11	18	23
	e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	4	4	13
	f. No answer	0	0	0
		100%	100%	100%
22.	**Skills deficiencies**			
	a. Not a problem or concern at all	55%	49%	57%
	b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	19	22	13
	c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	9	7	0
	d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	13	22	13
	e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	4	0	17
	f. No answer	0	0	0
		100%	100%	100%
23.	**Course difficulties**			
	a. Not a problem or concern at all	47%	39%	30%
	b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	19	25	30
	c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	4	11	0
	d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	19	21	27
	e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	11	4	13
	f. No answer	0	0	0
		100%	100%	100%
24.	**Grades**			
	a. Not a problem or concern at all	53%	46%	33%
	b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	19	25	33
	c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	4	4	0
	d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	15	25	27
	e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	9	0	7
	f. No answer	0	0	0
		100%	100%	100%
25.	**Grievance issues**			
	a. Not a problem or concern at all	60%	71%	74%
	b. A concern, but not discussed with my advisor/s	17	18	13
	c. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was no help	2	0	3
	d. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of some help	15	7	7
	e. A concern and discussion with my advisor/s was of great help	6	4	3
	f. No answer	0	0	0
		100%	100%	100%

ADVISEE KNOWLEDGE

		E	I	II
26. Through General College, students can pursue all but which of the following educational paths: a. occupational certificates b. General Education and the Associate (two year) Degree c. transfer requirements d. Traditional four year degree programs	Correct	55%	43%	33%
	Incorrect	45	57	67
	Total	100%	100%	100%
27. General College doesn't offer certificate programs in: a. aging studies b. marketing c. radiologic technology d. political science	Correct	21%	36%	30%
	Incorrect	79	64	70
	Total	100%	100%	100%
28. General College offers students: a. basic skills courses to thelp them in transferring to other colleges b. upper-division, junior/senior courses c. occupational programs d. all of the above	Correct	53%	54%	73%
	Incorrect	47	46	27
	Total	100%	100%	100%
29. General College students who complete an AA degree and decide to continue on for a four-year degree in General College: a. can simply continue to register as they did in the AA program b. must first get their advisor's approval c. merely submit a transcript showing proof of a B average d. must make formal application to a General College Baccalaureate Programs Admissions Committee	Correct	32%	46%	57%
	Incorrect	68	54	43
	Total	100%	100%	100%
30. The requirements for obtaining the General College Associate of Arts Degree include all of the following except: a. acquiring 90 passing credits b. maintaining a C+ average c. taking a minimum of 30 credits in GC d. passing a general (comprehensive) exam	Correct	25%	18%	13%
	Incorrect	75	82	87
	Total	100%	100%	100%

	E	I	II

31. Which item below is not correct regarding transfer requirements to the College of Liberal Arts? Students must:
    a. complete at least 36 transferable credits
    b. register for and received a C in at least 2 College of Liberal Arts classes
    c. formally request a transfer through a counselor in Room 10 in Nicholson Hall
    d. Maintain at least a B average during their freshman year

Correct	45%	29%	47%
Incorrect	55	71	53
Total	100%	100%	100%

32. Carrying fewer than 12 credits during fall, winter, or spring quarter will not affect students in which of the following ways:
    a. might result in the loss of financial aid eligibility
    b. might result in the loss of athletic eligibility
    c. could be an appropriate choice for some students
    d. Will result in dismissal from General College

Correct	23%	32%	37%
Incorrect	77	68	64
Total	100%	100%	100%

33. University financial aid is available to General College students in the form of:
    a. loans
    b. scholarships
    c. grants in aid
    d. all of the above

Correct	83%	82%	83%
Incorrect	17	18	17
Total	100%	100%	100%

34. After having completed formal registration, a student who then wishes to make a course change:
    a. must always obtain instructor approval
    b. need not obtain instructor approval up to the third week of class
    c. must have written instructor permission to enter a class after the end of the first week of a quarter
    d. none of the above applies

Correct	45%	21%	27%
Incorrect	55	79	73
Total	100%	100%	100%

35. Cancelling a course before the end of the second week of a quarter requires:
    a. written permission from the instructor
    b. an advisor's signature on a cancel-add form
    c. a counselor's written permission
    d. all of the above applies

Correct	28%	57%	37%
Incorrect	72	43	63
Total	100%	100%	100%

36. Students who wish to cancel a class:
    a. must do so by the 6th week of a quarter, otherwise they must complete the course for a grade
    b. must always have the course instructor sign a cancel-add form
    c. may do so without instructor permission up to the 6th week of the quarter, after which instructor permission is required
    d. must at all times formally petition approval from the Student Scholastic Standing Committee

	E	I	II
Correct	17%	25%	23%
Incorrect	83	75	74
Total	100%	100%	100%

37. The advisor's job in General College includes assisting students in all the tasks below except:
    a. planning registration for upcoming quarters
    b. psychological counseling over personal problems
    c. explaining college majors
    d. helping students with long-range educational plans

Correct	79%	86%	87%
Incorrect	21	14	13
Total	100%	100%	100%

38. General College skills centers offer students all of the following <u>except</u>:
    a. help with improving reading or basic math abilities
    b. tutorial assistance in understanding regular class assignments
    c. a writing service center that will write papers for students
    d. assistance in writing style on papers assigned in regular classes

Correct	55%	68%	67%
Incorrect	45	32	33
Total	100%	100%	100%

39. Students who want to take career interest and aptitude tests can do so:
    a. through the student's association office
    b. in any advisor's office
    c. through the counseling office
    d. no where on campus since career counseling is not available at the University

Correct		43%	73%
Incorrect		57	27
Total		100%	100%

40. A student unsure of degree major, but still desiring to make educational progress should select courses based on general education distribution requirements which include:
    a. natural sciences
    b. arts/humanities
    c. social science
    d. all of the above

Correct	77%	75%	90%
Incorrect	23	25	10
Total	100%	100%	100%

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
GENERAL COLLEGE ADVISING QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is part of a pilot study to evaluate the effectiveness of advising procedures used at General College. Your careful consideration and attention to each question will be appreciated. The questionnaire consists of two parts. The first section is a satisfaction survey. The second section surveys your understanding of various General College policies and procedures. Please read the questionnaire items carefully and respond as quickly as possible. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Answer the following questions by filling in the appropriate letter on the attached answer sheet.

2. Please enter only one response per question.

3. Return the questionnaire to Room 50 Nicholson Hall for either Pat Kroll, Joyce Grahn or Peter Kahn.

4. All information from this questionnaire will be held strictly confidential and released in summary form only. Your identity and your individual answers will be known to no one.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Sex: a. Male b. Female

2. Age: a. 17 or under b. 18-22 c. 23-25 d. 26 or over

3. Name of your currently assigned adviser:

   a. Grahn b. Kahn c. Kroll

4. The number of times you contacted your adviser/s during this quarter?

   a. 0-2 b. 3-5 c. 6 or more

5. Education plans in GC?
   a. A.A.
   b. B.A.S. or B.G.S.
   c. Certificate
   d. Transfer elsewhere
   e. Other_____

6. Approach you usually use in seeing your adviser/s:
   a. Make an appointment in advance by phone
   b. Make an appointment by signing up on a designated sheet
   c. Stop in during office hours without an appointment
   d. Stop in at any time and hope to find the adviser/s available
   e. Other--Please state_____

7. Accessibility of your adviser/s, considering your method of contact?
   a. Always accessible
   b. Usually accessible
   c. Sometimes accessible
   d. Seldom accessible
   e. Never accessible

8. Time spent planning your program before seeing your adviser/s:
   a. Two hours or more
   b. One to two hours
   c. A half hour to one hour
   d. A half hour or less
   e. No time

9. When did you see your adviser/s:
   a. Before assigned registration date
   b. On assigned registration date
   c. After assigned registration date
   d. Did not see my assigned adviser at all

ADVISING SATISFACTION:

10. How well informed are your adviser/s about your academic interests (course prerequisites, course content and level, etc.) ?
    a. Able to answer or advise me correctly on almost every question I raise
    b. Either knows the answer or will find out for me
    c. Somewhat helpful
    d. Little or no help at all
    e. Very poor, has even given me wrong information

11. Helpfulness of your adviser/s referring you to appropriate sources when you have questions or problems which your adviser/s cannot handle?
    a. Very helpful
    b. Moderately helpful
    c. Little or not at all helpful
    d. Very poor; has misdirected me
    e. Cannot say, since such a situation never arose

12. From whom do you receive the most help in regristration program planning?
    a. Assigned adviser/s
    b. Faculty member other than assigned adviser/s
    c. College office staff member other than assigned adviser/s
    d. College administrator
    e. Other students

13. Rate your overall satisfaction with your present adviser:
    a. Very satisfied
    b. Satisfied
    c. Neutral
    d. Dissatisfied
    e. Very dissatisfied

14. If you were in position to recommend advisers to other students in your major field, what would you say about your adviser?
    a. My adviser is very competent; I would recommend him/her without qualification
    b. My adviser is competent in most areas of advising; I would recommend him/her with some qualification
    c. My adviser is about average; I would recommend her/him as being not too great but not too bad either
    d. My adviser does not function well in her/his advisery capacity; I would recommend that other students try to get someone else

15-30. For each item, please indicate your answers on the answer sheet with the following codes:
a. Not a problem or concern at all
b. A concern, but not discussed with my adviser/s
c. A concern and discussion with my adviser/s was of no help
d. A concern and discussion with my adviser/s was of some help
e. A concern and discussion with my adviser/s was of great help

Quarterly Registration Concerns

15. Course selection
16. Class scheduling
17. Cancel-add procedures

Long Range Educational/Occupational Concerns

18. Two year degree goals/plans/options
19. Four year degree goals/plans/options
20. Certificate programs/opportunities
21. Internship programs/opportunities
22. Transfer requirements & procedures

Personal Problems and Concerns

23. Financial problems
24. Employment problems

General Academic Concerns

25. Financial aid
26. Study habits/course load
27. Skills deficiencies
28. Course difficulties
29. Grades
30. Grievance issues

ADVISEE KNOWLEDGE

31. Through General College, students can pursue all but which of the following educational paths:
a. occupational certificates
b. General Education and the Associate (two year) Degree
c. transfer requirements
d. Traditional four year degree programs

32. General College doesn't offer certificate programs in:
a. aging studies
b. marketing
c. radiologic technology
d. political science

33. General College offers students:
a. basic skills courses to help them in transferring to other colleges
b. upper-division, junior/senior courses
c. occupational programs
d. all the above

34. General College students who complete an AA degree and decide to continue on for a four-year degree in General College:
a. can simply continue to register as they did in the AA program
b. must first get their adviser's approval
c. merely submit a transcript showing proof of a B average
d. must make formal application to a General College Baccalaureate Programs Admissions Committee

35. The requirements for obtaining the General College Associate of Arts Degree include all of the following except:
    a. acquiring 90 passing credits
    b. maintaining a C+ average
    c. taking a minimum of 30 credits in GC
    d. passing a general (comprehensive) exam

36. Which item below is <u>not</u> correct regarding transfer requirements to the College of Liberal Arts? Students must:
    a. complete at least 36 transferable credits
    b. register for and received a C in at least 2 College of Liberal Arts classes
    c. formally request a transfer through a counselor in Room 10 in Nicholson Hall
    d. Maintain at least a B average during their freshman year.

37. Carrying fewer than 12 credits during fall, winter, or spring quarter will not affect students in which of the following ways:
    a. might result in the loss of financial aid eligibility
    b. might result in the loss of athletic eligibility
    c. could be an appropriate choice for some students
    d. will <u>result</u> in dismissal from General College

38. University financial aid is available to General College students in the form of:
    a. loans
    b. scholarships
    c. grants in aid
    d. all of the above

39. After having completed formal registration, a student who then wishes to make a course change:
    a. must always obtain instructor approval
    b. need not obtain instructor approval up to the third week of class
    c. must have written instructor permission to enter a class after the end of the first week of a quarter
    d. none of the above applies

40. Cancelling a course before the end of the second week of a quarter requires:
    a. written permission from the instructor
    b. an adviser's signature on a cancel-add form
    c. a counselor's written permission
    d. all of the above applies

41. Students who wish to cancel a class:
    a. must do so by the 6th week of a quarter, other wise they must complete the course for a grade
    b. must always have the course instructor sign a cancel-add form
    c. may do so without instructor permission up to the 6th week of the quarter, after which instructor permission is required
    d. must at all times formally petition approval from the Student Scholastic Standing Committee

42. The adviser's job in General College includes assisting students in all the tasks below except:
    a. planning registration for upcoming quarters
    b. psychological counseling over personal problems
    c. explaining college majors
    d. helping students with long-range educational plans

43. General College skills centers offer students all of the following except:
    a. help with improving reading or basic math abilities
    b. tutorial assistance in understanding regular class assignments
    c. a writing service center that will write papers for students
    d. assistance in writing style on papers assigned in regualr classes

44. Students who want to take career interest and aptitude tests can do so:
    a. through the student's association office
    b. in any adviser's office
    c. through the counseling office
    d. no where on campus since career counseling is not available at the University

45. A student unsure of degree major, but still desiring to make educational progress should select courses based on general education distribution requirements which include:
    a. natural sciences
    b. arts/humanities
    c. social science
    d. all of the above

References

Aitken, Caroline E. and Clifton R. Conrad, "Improving Academic Advising through Computerization," College and University, (Fall, 1977), pp. 115-123.

Biggs, Donald A., Jane Silon Brodie, and William J. Barnhart, "The Dynamics of Undergraduate Advising," Research in Higher Education, (1975), Vol. 3, pp. 345-357.

Brown, Coke R. and Rosemary Myers, "Student vs. Faculty Curriculum Advising," Journal of College Student Personnel, (May, 1975), pp. 226-231.

Crookston, Burns R., "A Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching," Journal of College Student Personnel, (January, 1972), pp. 12-17.

General College Bulletin, University of Minnesota, 1979-81, p. 8.

Grites, Thomas J., "Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties," AAHE/ERIC Higher Education Research Reports #7, Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979, ED 178023, HE 011953.

Hutchins, David E. and William B. Miller, "Group Interaction As a Vehicle to Facilitate Faculty-Student Advisement," Journal of College Student Personnel, (May, 1979), pp. 253-257.

Johnson, John and Katherine Sprandel, "Centralized Academic Advising at Department Level: A Model," University College Quarterly, (1975), pp. 17-19.

Mash, Donald J., "Academic Advising Too Often Taken for Granted," The College Board Review, (Spring, 1978), No. 107, pp. 33-36.

McCusker, Ann Marie and Blair L. Osterlund, "Community College Advising Model," Personnel and Guidance Journal, (February, 1979), pp. 319-320.

Murry, John P., "The Comparative Effectiveness of Student-to-Student and Faculty Advising Programs," Journal of College Student Personnel, (November, 1979), pp. 562-566.

Polson, Cheryl Jean and Anthony P. Jurich, "The Departmental Academic Advising Center: An Alternative to Faculty Advising," Journal of College Student Personnel, (May, 1979), pp. 249-252.

Stein, Gordon B. and Henry A. Spille, "Academic Advising Reaches Out," Personnel and Guidance Journal, (September, 1974), Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 61-64.

Teague, Gerald V., "Community College Student Satisfaction with Four Types of Academic Advisement," Journal of College Student Personnel, (July, 1977), pp. 281-285.

Walsh, E. Michael, "Revitalizing Academic Advisement," Personnel and Guidance Journal, (May, 1979), pp. 446-449.

Zultowski, Walter H. and David W. Catron, "Students as Curriculum Advisers: Reinterpreted," Journal of College Student Personnel, (May, 1976), pp. 199-204.